

Puget Sound Education and Outreach Survey Report

Prepared for
Puget Sound Partnership
by Environmental Education Association of Washington



December 2008

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Executive Summary	3
Background	6
Results.....	9
Findings and Recommendations	23
Appendix.....	26
Organizations	41
Education and Outreach Survey Round II	44
Survey Background	46
Acknowledgments	46

Executive Summary

Introduction

"Citizens must do more than accept the plan; they must become knowledgeable, enthusiastic advocates for Puget Sound and be willing to practice what the plan preaches. The future of the Sound depends upon a massive effort to change the attitudes and habits of everyone who lives in the Puget Sound basin." Puget Sound Recovery Plan, December 1986

Education and outreach programs have consistently played an important role in connecting the missions and programs of public agencies to behavior change in Washington's residents.

Through this survey, the Puget Sound Partnership (Partnership), created in 2007, endeavors to assess education and outreach programs around Puget Sound as part of a larger strategy to restore the health of Puget Sound by 2020. In particular, the Partnership was interested in surveying non-formal education programs to determine their status and level of resources.

A key partner in developing the survey was ECO-Net, formed by the Partnership to assist in coordinating education and outreach efforts around the Sound. ECO-Net provided advisory input to the survey in order to gain baseline information about organizations and agencies that provide education and outreach programs. Members of the ECO-Net group have also provided leadership for another initiative, E3 Washington (Economy, Environment, Education) coordinated by the Environmental Education Association of Washington (EEAW), to develop regional and state-wide environmental education networks and strategies.

Because of this synergy, the Partnership contracted with EEAW to design, develop and administer a survey of education and outreach providers around Puget Sound to assist it in making policy and fiscal proposals for the next Biennium (2009-2011).

The Survey

In May-July 2008, a 25-question survey was developed and reviewed by two sets of experienced educators and ECO-Net members. The survey was then made available on-line to a pre-selected sample of 109 organizations and agencies involved in education and outreach around Puget Sound. This purposive survey was targeted to a specific cross section due to time constraints and the need to report back to the Partnership in a timely fashion. The cross section was chosen based on geography (county), size of organization or agency, area population and focus of the organization or agency.

In late October and early November 2008, a link to this on-line survey (with some minor changes) was sent out through listservs, mailing lists, databases and the E3 Washington regional networks initially to 1,074 email addresses to connect with as many education and outreach providers as possible. A link to the survey was also sent out to key contacts in each of the Puget Sound counties to encourage participation in the survey. Informal forwarding of the initial email link would have also reached more participants than could be tracked. Participants who filled out the purposive survey were asked not to fill out this second, essentially the same, survey. If they did not remember, they were encouraged to call which many did.

Recommendations

Recommendations are provided in this report to

- increase the impact of education and outreach programs on the clean-up of Puget Sound and
- develop greater synergy and collaboration between educators and communications specialists and others who are working to clean-up Puget Sound including policy makers, scientists, community leaders, environmental organizations and other groups each of whom have different professional cultures and norms.

Topic and issue areas should be prioritized and communicated to education and outreach providers to ensure focused efforts towards common goals.

The following recommendations are a synthesis of an analysis of two rounds of the same survey. Round I was a targeted sample – a purposive survey – to gain an initial picture of education and outreach program providers around Puget Sound. Previous recommendations made in the report dated September 2008 (*Puget Sound Education and Outreach – Purposive Survey Report*) have been incorporated into this report and updated based on any new information revealed in the more comprehensive survey in Round II. Results between the two surveys are very similar in the responses given by participants.

Education and outreach organizations and agencies should be given greater support in developing measurable goals and assessing the progress of those goals. A Program Assessment Team should be formed to provide this support and guidance. Through an evaluation and assessment process, the Team can also give feedback on the most effective techniques, tools and methods to develop a Best Practices model useful for those working in education and outreach efforts.

Key educational messages targeted at specific audiences should be developed that are aligned with the goals of the Partnership. Depending on the priorities of the Partnership, it may be necessary to identify groups that can provide support for education and outreach subjects that groups might not currently focus on.

Support for non-formal education and outreach providers should be increased and strengthened. Much of the valuable education and outreach work is done by very small staffs and budgets. Providing greater resources will increase the capacity of these groups to change public perceptions and habits.

Collaboration and synergy should be increased across professional areas and work cultures. The different work cultures between organizations and agencies need to be bridged to focus the non-formal education and outreach community on the work at hand.

This survey did not tell us how effective programs are at changing public perceptions, knowledge, values and actions that taken in the aggregate would contribute significantly to cleaning-up and protecting the ecological viability of Puget Sound.

In coordination with Partnership staff, EEA released the second round of the survey for a three week period to all organizations and agencies in the 12-county Puget Sound Region that involved in education and outreach efforts. An extensive outreach effort was launched to encourage

participation in the survey. Round II was a more comprehensive look at the state of education and outreach around Puget Sound. The results from the Purposive Survey are compared to the results of Round II in this report..

Next Steps

Puget Sound Partnership staff and the Leadership Council should be briefed on the results and recommendations of the survey and make the case for enhanced funding for education and outreach strategies to address the cleanup and stewardship of Puget Sound. Policy issues and budget priorities could be influenced by the survey recommendations.

The results of this survey should be also be communicated to the survey advisory team members, survey participants, ECO-Net members and the general environmental and sustainability education community in the Puget Sound area through distribution lists and posting on the ECO-Net portion of the Puget Sound Partnership's website and the E3 Washington and EEAW websites.

The survey results and the Partnership's education and outreach recommendations should also be presented at relevant meetings, workshops and conferences that focus on education and outreach around Puget Sound including Storming the Sound, and E3 regional and sector gatherings, the EEAW conference and others. Opportunities for educators to become involved in implementation of recommendations should be provided.

The survey can add important information to the ongoing conversations on how education and outreach are essential in the cleanup of Puget Sound.

Background

During the 2007 legislative session, the Puget Sound Partnership (Partnership) was created, a new agency dedicated to restoring Puget Sound's environmental health by 2020. From the outset, there was strong interest in utilizing the expertise and experience of non-profit and community organizations, and local or regional government agencies, including education and communication providers throughout the Sound. Many of these organizations and agencies have an extensive history and strong relationships with their local communities or regions and together, could greatly influence public behavior and actions impacting the health of the Sound.

Until this survey and report, little was known cumulatively about the work, impact and resources (human and capital) available to address the priorities of the Partnership, especially in the arena of education and outreach. In 2007, the ECO-Net steering committee was formed to inform the newly established Partnership about organizations and agencies doing education and outreach work around Puget Sound and to make recommendations for the 2020 agenda.

With the formation of E3 Washington (Economy, Environment and Education), a comprehensive effort was launched to assess education and outreach providers in all sectors and regions of the state. Concurrently, a funding subcommittee of ECO-Net identified the need for additional information specific to the Puget Sound region. This group acknowledged the newly established network of leaders and providers and Environmental Education Resource Center (EERC) a searchable directory created for E3 Washington, an initiative coordinated by the Environmental Education Association of Washington (EEAW). E3 has Governor Gregoire as an honorary co-chair and is supported by many agencies and organizations throughout the region and state. A contract between EEAW and the Partnership was initiated to utilize these resources and design, develop and administer a survey of education and outreach programs around Puget Sound to assist the Partnership in developing policy and fiscal proposals for the next Biennium (2009-2011).

Survey Design

As a first step in conducting data, a Purposive Survey of education and outreach programs around Puget Sound was conducted and this report is the result of that survey. A Purposive Survey is defined as: *"a non-probability sample selection method where respondents are selected according to a personal and/or subjective judgment about which members of the population would be the most representative."*

Source: <http://www2.stats.govt.nz/domino/external/omni/omni.nsf/23f076d733ded7e74c256570001d92b4/b1382c8795bca2a8cc2569030012acc7?OpenDocument>

Round II of this survey was undertaken October – November 2008 to sample any organization or agency interested in completing the survey. Results from the Purposive Survey and Round II are compared in this report to gain a comprehensive and complete picture of education and outreach programs around Puget Sound.

Groups invited to participate in the Purposive Survey were selected on the basis of geography (each of the 12 counties surrounding Puget Sound); population (each of the 12 counties were allocated five groups including local tribes with the each of the most populous counties allocated

additional slots based on their populations); Puget Sound-wide coverage (six organizations or agencies with Puget Sound-wide coverage), types of agencies or organizations (small/large – based on budget – non-profits or government agencies) and the topic area which most identified the group.

For more detailed information, please see the document - *Puget Sound Partnership and E3 Washington Survey of Puget Sound Education and Outreach Provider Organizations and Agencies* – in the Appendix.

The Survey Design and Plan was reviewed and vetted by a small “Kitchen Cabinet” working advisory group and a larger group of people from ECO-Net representing a variety of Puget Sound education and outreach interests. For more details, please see the Acknowledgements section in the Appendix.

In Round II of this survey, a link to the on-line survey was sent out through listservs, mailing lists, databases and the E3 Washington regional networks initially to 1,074 email addresses to connect with as many education and outreach providers as possible. A link to the survey was also sent out to key contacts in each of the Puget Sound counties to encourage participation in the survey. Informal forwarding of the initial email link would have also reached more participants than could be tracked. Participants who filled out the above survey were asked not to fill out this second, essentially the same, survey. A concerted effort was made to provide any interested education and outreach program providers with the opportunity to fill out the survey.

Research Questions

The following questions guided the survey:

- What educational infrastructure is in place around Puget Sound that could help to achieve the objectives of the Puget Sound Partnership? (staffing levels, numbers of groups, levels of expertise, methods and tools used to educate the public, types of programs, facilities owned and operated, audiences served – ages, languages, geographic locations – urban, rural, suburban and ability to engage citizens through their activities)
- What is the financial status (stability, source of funds) of groups, organizations and government agencies that develop and present education and outreach programs around Puget Sound?
- Do the priorities and focuses of these groups, organizations and agencies make any connections to the work objectives of the Puget Sound Partnership?

Purposive Survey – Round I

A 25-question survey was developed and placed on-line (www.SurveyMonkey.com). The actual survey questions are included in the Appendix

Before the on-line survey was sent out, additional advice was sought from individuals for names of organizations and agencies in their community or region that should be sent a survey link. These names were tallied and a final list of survey participants was developed. Please see the attached PDF file of an Excel spreadsheet – Purposive Survey Matrix.

The survey was open on-line for two full weeks (July 31 -- August 13, 2008). A reminder was sent halfway through this time period and at 24 hours before the closing deadline. An incentive (\$25 discount for registration at the Fall 2008 Environmental Education Association of Washington Annual Conference) was offered to survey recipients to encourage their participation.

Round II

The same survey as described above with some modifications described below was open from October 29 – November 19, 2008. Reminders were sent halfway through the time period and 72 hours in advance of the deadline. An incentive (\$25 discount for registration at the Fall 2008 Environmental Education Association of Washington Annual Conference) was offered to survey recipients to encourage their participation if they completed the survey by November 11, 2008.

In Round II, the following items were changed based on reviewing the results of the Purposive Survey and the requests of the Puget Sound Partnership.

- Question #1 – Category of Respondent: University was added as a category
- Question #10 – Puget Sound Partnership Objectives: Answers were changed to better reflect actual PSP Objectives
- Questions #16 – Number of Volunteers: Question was changed to determine exact numbers of volunteers
- Question #17 – Volunteer Hours: Question was changed to determine exact numbers of volunteer hours
- Question #21 – Deficits: Question was dropped due to the very low numbers of deficits noted in Round I

Results

The survey was organized into four sub-sections (demographics, effectiveness and alignment, resources and survey participant). Actual survey questions are included in the Appendix of this report.

Survey Participation

Purposive Survey – Round I

Over 100 recipients were sent a link to the survey (additional inks were sent to military contacts).

The total number of responses indicated that:

- 56 started the survey
- 43 completed the entire survey (i.e. answered every question)

Although this is a good response rate for a survey (51%), the 13 respondents who Started vs. Completed may indicate the level of detailed information (i.e. financial and staffing) and/or time needed to complete the survey. This also may indicate that some participants might not be willing to share their financial information despite an assurance of confidentiality. Another factor may be that the survey was administered during the summer season and prime vacation time.

Round II

A minimum of 1,074 people were initially sent a link to the online survey. This number is probably higher due to informal forwarding of the initial message and the follow-up emails sent to key contacts in each of the 12-county Puget Sound Region.

The total number of responses indicated that:

- 104 started the survey
- 87 completed the entire survey (i.e. answered every question)

The 17 respondents who Started vs. Completed may indicate the level of detailed information (i.e. financial and staffing) and/or time needed to complete the survey. This also may indicate that some participants might not be willing to share their financial information despite an assurance of confidentiality. Another factor may be that the survey was administered during the summer season and prime vacation time.

Survey Section 1 - Tell us about what, who and where you work

In this section, survey participants were asked to classify their organization or agency, list its service area(s) and office location, what focuses and priorities it has, what audience and numbers it serves, what techniques and tools it uses and how familiar and aligned they were with the Puget Sound Partnership.

Purposive Survey – Round I

Question #1 - Classification

About 48% of the 56 respondents considered themselves some type of non-profit organization with about 6% tribal and 48% some type of government agency. Within the “Other” category, several university-related programs such as WSU Extension were listed. Despite being a government institution, the next survey should include a category of University Program or include this type of program in the description under Government.

Round II

About 47% of the 104 respondents classified themselves as representing a government agency with about 32% considering themselves a non-profit agency. A University category was added in Round II based on comments received in Round I – this category represented around 9% of respondents. For Profit corporations or companies represented 8% and tribal governments or organizations 2 % in this round.

Question #2 - Counties Served

Purposive Survey – Round I

Within the survey results, each of the 12 Puget Sound Counties were represented relatively equally with King, Pierce and Snohomish slightly highest. Surveys were originally distributed weighted towards the higher population counties (Snohomish, King, Pierce and Kitsap). More organizations and agencies in these counties were solicited for input proportionally based on the population of the county in relationship to the 12 counties in Puget Sound.

Round II

Again with the survey results, each of the 12 Puget Sound Counties were represented with King, Pierce, Snohomish and Thurston represented in proportion to their populations. Respondents could answer more than county if their programs served several counties at once.

Question #3 – Zip Codes

Purposive Survey – Round I & Round II

A variety of zip codes are listed.

Question #4 – Subjects Focused On

Purposive Survey – Round I

Participants were asked to check off all subjects that applied to their education and outreach efforts. Of the 53 respondents to this question, the top five areas focused on were –

Wildlife	85%
Habitat Restoration	77%
Water Quality	72%
Conservation	66%
Citizen Science	57%

The subjects least focused on were

Environmental Justice/	
Public Health	23%
Green Trades	21%
Aquaculture	17%
Land Acquisition	15%
Environ. Economics	6%

Round II

Again, participants were asked to check off all subjects that applied to their education and outreach efforts. Of the 100 respondents to this question, the top five areas focused on were –

Water Quality	66%
Wildlife	63%
Conservation	61%
Habitat Restoration	60%
Stormwater	50%

The subjects least focused on were

Environmental Justice/	
Public Health	25%
Green Trades	17%
Aquaculture	16%
Land Acquisition	15%
Environ. Economics	14%

Although some subject focuses changed in Round II for those topics focused on, it is revealing that the least subjects remained in the exact order with slightly different percentages. Stormwater emerged in this Round as a subject for 50% of the respondents.

Question #5 – Rating Priorities of Subjects

Using the same list of Subjects Focused On from Question #4, participants were asked to rank the top five subjects that their organization or agency programs spend the most time and money on from Highest to Medium High to Medium to Lesser to Low.

Purposive Survey – Round I

Within the Highest category, eight groups listed Habitat Restoration as their highest priority subject, Within the Medium High category, eight groups listed Water Quality as their second highest priority. Within the Medium category, there was a tie between Citizen Science and Habitat Restoration with seven groups each listing both as a medium priority. In the Lesser category, seven groups chose Wildlife as their Lesser priority and six groups chose Water Quality as their Low priority out of their top five selections.

Round II

Within the Highest category, twelve groups listed Wildlife as their highest priority subject, Within the Medium High category, fourteen groups listed Water Quality as their second highest priority. Within the Medium category, thirteen groups choose Habitat Restoration. In the Lesser category, twelve groups chose Water Quality as their Lesser priority and eight groups chose Habitat Restoration as

their Low priority out of their top five selections. Overall Water Quality and Habitat Restoration were the two categories most selected as some kind of a priority for respondents

Question #6 -- Target Audiences

Purposive Survey – Round I

What are the audiences targeted by respondents to this survey?

General Audiences	77%
Educators/Teachers	67%
Volunteers	67%
Home/Property Owners	65%
Students (all Grades)	63-65%

Overall there were 26 different choices that respondents to the survey could choose. The above represent the highest ranked choices from the survey results.

The use of the General Audience category means that many groups present programs to the general public without a specific type of group present as a target. Volunteer training reflects the training of volunteers to do the work of the organization or agency thus extending the impact of staff. The education system is certainly a focus of many organizations and agencies reflecting a priority of reaching teachers and students. Interestingly, all grades K-12 were targeted relatively equally in this survey. Typically school programs are focused on elementary school students.

Round II

What are the audiences targeted by respondents to this survey?

Educators/Teachers	70%
General Audiences	64%
Volunteers	54%
Home/Property Owners	54%
Students (all Grades)	55-60%

Rounds I & II compare very closely in the responses to this question.

Question #7 -- Techniques, Methods and Tools

Purposive Survey – Round I

The top ten Techniques, Methods and Tools chosen by respondents include the following list in order:

- Community Events (special or annual events) 90%
- Partnerships 88%*
- Printed Materials 86%
- Public Events (presentations, lectures, multi-media events) 84%
- Restoration Activities 68%
- Media 64%
- Educating Elected Officials and Other Decision Makers 58%
- Curriculum Resources 56%
- Conferences 56%

- Web-based Tool 50%

*Although technically not an educational technique, method or tool, partnerships are an important tool to increase the capacity of smaller operations to disseminate messages to a broader audience.

Round II

- Community Events (special or annual events) 84%
- Partnerships 80%*
- Printed Materials 80%
- Public Events (presentations, lectures, multi-media events) 73%
- Curriculum Resources 61%
- Media 56%
- Web-based Tool 48%
- Restoration Activities 47%
- Educating Elected Officials and Other Decision Makers 45%
- Conferences 43%

*Although technically not an educational technique, method or tool, partnerships are an important tool to increase the capacity of smaller operations to disseminate messages to a broader audience.

Rounds I & II compare closely in the responses to this question.

Question #8 – Numbers in Attendance

Purposive Survey – Round I

Respondents were asked how many people were reached in three categories – Live/In Person, Media (Web or Print) and Special Events. Most groups reached 1001-5000 people in their education and outreach efforts for Live/In Person activities. Media expands coverage with 13 groups reaching 20,000 - 50,000+. Special Events play a role in reaching 500-5000 people for 22 groups.

Round II

In this survey round, most groups reached 1001-5000 people in their education and outreach efforts for Live/In Person activities. Media expands coverage with 17 groups reaching 20,000 - 50,000+. Special Events play a role in reaching 251-1000 people for 32 groups.

Question #9 – Familiarity with Puget Sound Partnership plans

Purposive Survey – Round I

A strong number of respondents (84%) rated themselves from Familiar to Extremely Familiar with the plans for the Puget Sound Partnership to clean up Puget Sound by 2020. Respondents appear to be following developments with the Partnership.

Round II

A slightly smaller number of respondents (74%) rated themselves from Familiar to Extremely Familiar with the plans for the Puget Sound Partnership to clean up Puget Sound by 2020. Again, respondents appear to be following developments with the Partnership.

Question #10 – Alignment with the Puget Sound Partnership Objectives

Purposive Survey – Round I

Most organizations and agencies responding to this survey seem to be aligned with the work objectives of the Partnership. However, the Partnership's objectives were not specifically explained nor were examples given in the survey and organizations and agencies might not completely understand what the Partnership means using these objectives.

The Partnership's objectives ranked by respondents for alignment with their programs are:

- Protect existing habitat and prevent further losses (this includes land use programs) 81%
- Protect ecosystem diversity and protect imperiled species 79%
- Restore habitat functions and values 77%
- Improve water quality and habitat by managing stormwater runoff 71%
- Build and sustain capacity for action. 65%
- Significantly reduce toxics entering Puget Sound fresh and marine water 65%
- Significantly reduce nutrients and pathogens entering Puget Sound fresh and marine waters 56%
- Provide water for people, fish and wildlife, and the environment 54%

Round II

In Round II, the same question was asked but the Partnership wanted the answers listed to more closely match their actual work objectives. The answers below also reflect that many groups are working within the areas of interest to the Partnership. Answers to this specific question however cannot be directly compared due to the different choices of answers provided.

- Reduce the sources of water pollution 76%
- Protect intact ecosystem processes, structure and function 67%
- Restore ecosystems processed, structure and function 62%
- Work together effectively and efficiently as a system on priority needs 56%
- None of the above 7%
- I do not understand these objectives 0%

Survey Section 2 - Tell us how effective your program is and how you measure it

In this section, survey participants were asked how they felt the effectiveness of their programs were and what assessment process they might have used to determine their observation.

Question #11 – Outcomes or Changes Hope to See

Purposive Survey – Round I

In this question, participants were asked what changes or outcomes they hoped to see among people attending their education and outreach programs. The top four outcomes and their respective percentages are listed below.

- Increased change in personal practices at home or work 92%
- Increased knowledge of conservation issues facing Puget Sound 90%

- Increased involvement in conservation issues 89%
- Satisfaction with our education and outreach efforts 83%

Round II

The top four outcomes and their respective percentages in this round are listed below.

- Increased change in personal practices at home or work 88%
- Satisfaction with our education and outreach efforts 78%
- Increased involvement in conservation issues 70%
- Increased knowledge of conservation issues facing Puget Sound 69%

The four top priorities are the same for these two survey rounds with a slightly different change in order.

Question #12 – Measurements of Outcomes or Changes

Using the same list of changes and outcomes listed above in Question #11, survey respondents to this question were asked which of these outcomes or changes they actually measured.

Purposive Survey – Round I

By a far margin, the 45 survey respondents to this question listed the following change or outcome as the one element they measured.

- Satisfaction with our education and outreach efforts 71%

Respondents also listed the following changes or outcomes measured

- Increased change in personal practices at home or work 58%
- Increased attendance at restoration events 36%
- Increased knowledge of conservation issues facing Puget Sound 33%

Round II

Results in Round II were similar to Round I with some exceptions. A high percentage of respondents still listed the following outcome as one key outcome they measured.

- Satisfaction with our education and outreach efforts 64%

Respondents also listed the following changes or outcomes – the first outcome listed below is a drop in number from Round I (from 58% to 36%) with conservation issues now being the third choice joined by conservation action as the fourth choice.

- Increased change in personal practices at home or work 36%
- Increased knowledge of conservation issues facing Puget Sound 29%
- Increased involvement in conservation action 24%

Question #13 – Evaluation of Programs

Survey participants were asked if they evaluated their programs what technique or process they used.

Purposive Survey – Round I

The four methods listed below illustrates that most organizations and groups tend to use informal, in-house evaluation methods

- Informal (no formal process but review of program evaluation/customer satisfaction forms) 66%
- In-house (developed and administered evaluation by employees) 60%
- Formal (evaluation study--surveys, observations, focus groups--using statistical analysis) 50%
- External Evaluator or Consultant (non-employee hired for evaluation purposes) 18%
- Not applicable 12%

Round II

In Round II, the four methods continue to be listed in the same response order as Round I but the percentage numbers are changed somewhat. Most groups continued to use informal evaluation methods but numbers drop significantly for the use of In-house and Formal Evaluation.

- Informal (no formal process but review of program evaluation/customer satisfaction forms) 58%
- In-house (developed and administered evaluation by employees) 39%
- Formal (evaluation study--surveys, observations, focus groups--using statistical analysis) 32%
- External Evaluator or Consultant (non-employee hired for evaluation purposes) 16%
- Not applicable 18%

Tell us about the resources you have for supporting the work you do

In this section, we asked about the financial and human resources that organizations and agencies used to accomplish their education and outreach work (not the entire organization or agency).

Note: This section received a lower response rate to the overall survey (37-44 groups) possibly due to the need to retrieve the information from organizational or agency records. During the design of the survey, it was decided to permit respondents to skip questions to increase the overall response rate to the survey.

Question #14 – Full-Time Staff

Purposive Survey – Round I

Most organizations and agencies have small full-time education and outreach staffs if any. Nearly all groups (89%) have 0-5 staff members.

Round II

Numbers of staff change slightly with the larger sample size in this Round. In this Round, most groups (78%) have 0-5 staff members. Nearly 5% (4 groups) of respondents stated staff of 31+ which most likely represents government agencies.

Question #15 – Part-Time Staff

Purposive Survey – Round I

Education and outreach program part-time staffs are also small in number – most organizations and agencies (89%) have between 0-5 staff members.

Round II

Survey results in this round are similar – most organizations and agencies (82%) have between 0-5 staff members.

Question #16 – Volunteers

Purposive Survey – Round I

Most of the organizations and agencies utilize volunteers (91%). More than a third (41%) of the groups have up to 25 volunteers with the next largest grouping (16%) having 200+ volunteers.

Volunteers represent an important asset to these organizations and agencies in order to be able to do their work.

Round II

At the request of the Puget Sound Partnership, this question was reworded in Round II to ask about the exact number of volunteers (rather than ranges as in Round I) who contributed at least 25 hours on an annual basis. Responses to this question totaled 5567 volunteers.

Question #17 – Number of Volunteer Hours

Purposive Survey – Round I

Seven groups have education and outreach volunteers contributing 10,000 or more hours on an annual basis. More typically, hours contributed by volunteers in the majority of organizations and groups are in the range of 500-5000 hours.

If the minimum number of hours reported (152,000+) were calculated at the value of \$19.51 (the figure used in 2007 by the non-profit sector* as the average value per hour for volunteers), the total contribution would be valued at nearly \$3,000,000 (\$2,971,763.20) on an annual basis.

*Source - http://www.independentsector.org/programs/research/volunteer_time.html

Round II

At the request of the Puget Sound Partnership, this question was reworded for Round II to determine the exact totals (rather than ranges as in Round I) of volunteer hours. Respondents to this round reported a grand total of 46,517 hours contributed on an annual basis by their volunteers.

If this number of volunteer hours was calculated at the value of \$19.51 (the figure used in 2007 by the non-profit sector* as the average value per hour for volunteers), the total contribution would be valued at over \$900,000 (\$907,546.67) on an annual basis. This is a more specific number as associated with the survey respondents than the estimated figure shown above.

*Source - http://www.independentsector.org/programs/research/volunteer_time.html

Question #18 – Annual Budgets

Purposive Survey – Round I

Organizations and agencies filling out the survey seem to be evenly divided among the budget categories which may mean that a good cross-section of groups have been included in the survey. The majority of respondents (24%) have budgets under \$25,000 for their Education and Outreach Budgets which is probably non-profit groups given the typical size of these group budgets.

Size of Budget

Percentage of Respondents

Total Number of Groups

Under \$25,000	23.8%	10
\$25,001 -- \$50,000	16.7%	7
\$50,001 -- \$100,000	19.0%	8
\$100,001 -- \$250,000	14.3%	6
\$250,001 -- \$500,000	9.5%	4
\$500,001 -- \$1,000,000	7.1%	3
\$1,000,001+	9.5%	4

Round II

The division between the budget categories in this survey round is very similar to the above results. Organizations and agencies filling out the survey seem to be evenly divided among the budget categories. The majority of respondents (28%) have budgets under \$25,000 for their Education and Outreach Budgets which is probably non-profit groups given the typical size of these group budgets.

Size of Budget	Percentage of Respondents	Total Number of Groups
Under \$25,000	27.9%	19
\$25,001 -- \$50,000	17.6%	12
\$50,001 -- \$100,000	14.7%	10
\$100,001 -- \$250,000	11.8%	8
\$250,001 -- \$500,000	11.8%	8
\$500,001 -- \$1,000,000	5.9%	4
\$1,000,001+	0.3%	7

Question #19 – Budget Sources

Purposive Survey – Round I

Respondents were asked to tell us the sources of their Education and Outreach Budgets divided over the six categories listed below.

- Earned Revenues
- Grants
- Donors
- Foundation
- Membership Dues or Subscriptions
- Other Sources

The largest category listed was Grants at 46% of the groups then Earned Revenue (monies received after providing a product or service) at 35% of the groups. Lowest source of income was from Membership Dues or subscriptions at 4%. These numbers suggest that the main sources of funds are soft monies (i.e. grants) which are limited in their longevity and their ability to serve other purposes. For 54% of the groups, sources of funds are limited to the first four listed categories above.

Round II

Again the largest category listed was Grants followed by Earned Revenue and Other Sources categories.

Question #20 – Five Year Budgets

Purposive Survey – Round I

Organizations and groups were asked to state their cumulative budgets for the last five years (2002 – 2007) to give us a sense of the overall size of Education and Outreach Budgets. Nearly 36% (14 groups) of respondents checked off the category of \$100,000-500,000 (which would mean average annual budgets of \$20,000 – 100,000). Surprisingly, nearly 26% (10 groups) of respondents checked off the category of \$1,000,000 (which would mean average annual budgets of \$200,000).

This category illustrates that education and outreach programs differ widely in the size of their budgets.

Round II

The 100,000-500,000 category was selected by 32% (21 groups) in this round. And again similar to Round I, 23% of respondents in this survey round selected the category of \$1,000,000+ (15 groups) budgets which may represent government agencies.

Question #21 – Deficits and Question #21A – Number of Deficits

Purposive Survey – Round I

The vast majority (91%) of organizations and agencies did not run a deficit within the last five years. Only 4 groups out of the 42 groups that answered the question responded positively when asked if they had a deficit budget. Of those four groups, one group ran a deficit in one of the last five years, two groups in four of the last five years and last group did not know.

Deficit spending does not seem to be a problem with the majority of these groups.

Round II

This question was dropped in Round II

Tell us more about the person filling out this survey.

In this section, more information was requested about who filled out the survey.

Question #22 – Role Played by Survey Respondent

Purposive Survey – Round I

The vast majority (95%) of people filling out this section were either Executive Directors/Managers (50%) or education staff (45%). .

Round II

The majority of people filling out the survey in this round were staff people (51%) followed by Executive Director/Program Manager at 48%.

Question #23 – Name of Organization

Purposive Survey – Round I

A total of 56 organizations and agencies filled out the survey. Thirty four (34) groups opted to list themselves and this list is included in the Appendix. To ensure confidentiality and trust among survey participants, it was optional to identify the organization filling out the survey.

Round II

A total of 104 organizations and agencies filled out the survey. Sixty five (65) groups opted to list themselves and this list is included in the Appendix. To ensure confidentiality and trust among survey participants, it was optional to identify the organization filling out the survey.

Questions #24 – Additional Comments

Purposive Survey – Round I

Selected relevant comments posted in this section include:

- I can't rate the five focus areas in descending importance because we give high priorities in time and resources to several major areas. I also can't break out the funding sources for the annual budget.
- A major issue we face is the constant need to identify funding to carry out programs. Permanent funding for positions would significantly increase our impact.
- Our 100 hour training focuses on the watershed and ecosystem, not on a particular element of it. All are equally important and all relate to the problems we pose for Puget Sound.
- We would like more information on the Puget Sound Partnership, the goals of the organization, and the action items determined to meet the goals. Also, information on our role in this partnership and how we can be involved and included in this action plan would be appreciated.
- I am currently on the ECO Network Steering Committee for the Partnership and have conducted Education and Outreach programs for 15 years. The committee is working on a process and I believe that process has been developed and proven to work by the salmon lead entity process. Local EE groups provide accountability through prioritizing projects by

peer review, evaluation standards, dividing funds and partnering. The key to success is local coordination that is funded to accomplish the 2020 action agenda.

- I hope the PSP works in collaboration with each outreach group to develop the priority messages geared toward awareness building and behavior change, and works with local groups to help get these messages out. I also believe we must ask why the Puget Sound Water Quality Authority's effort failed, and actively address the outreach-component of these issues. This is a perfect opportunity for the PSP to take the opportunity to really look at the ultimate barriers toward change at the state-wide level....the "big elephants in the room" that none of us like to talk about. I'm referring to money and power of a select few who feel that they may have much to lose in this process, and their ability to influence politicians to make decisions in their best interest (which may not be in the best interest of the health of Puget Sound). Outreach and education to these targeted groups cannot be overlooked, and must be among the highest priority. Outreach to the "general public" or unpowerful special-interest groups will not work to save the Sound. Feel free to call if you'd like to brainstorm.

Round II

Selected comments from this round includes:

- Looking forward to the day where citizen science is available to high school and college age students. They have to do 100 hours of community service; how great would it be to tie some of these issues together giving them something interesting to work on.
- Under NPDES, small Phase II jurisdictions have big requirements and small resources....some, with no city-wide "media" (no local weekly or bi-weekly newspaper, no local low-watt AM or FM radio station) need financial support (from Ecology, PSP, Legislature ?) greater than stormwater rate increases can provide (or will be acceptable to the community). If you want to save Puget Sound, please earmark money for these small jurisdictions to fund "newsletters" or other media which can saturate the entire community on a regular basis. That's my perspective
- How will the Partnership help support organizations that are already working toward the goals of a healthy Puget Sound?
- No one has connected with the general public in the Bellingham neighborhoods and environmental educators about specific roles and tasks for the Puget Sound Partnership and for the E3 efforts. We need to be educated before we can mobilize.

Question #25 – Incentive Details

Purposive Survey – Round I

Twenty-two respondents chose to accept the incentive of a \$25 discount off of the registration fee for the Fall 2008 Annual Conference of the Environmental Education Association of Washington. Information from this category will be forwarded to EEA for their records.

Round II

Thirteen respondents in this round chose to accept the incentive of a \$25 discount off of the registration fee for the Fall 2008 Annual Conference of the Environmental Education Association of Washington. Information from this category will be forwarded to EEAW for their records.

Findings and Recommendations

The following recommendations are made to the Partnership based on the analysis of the Puget Sound Education and Outreach Purposive Survey – Round I and Round II.

Recommendation #1: Provide education and outreach providers with a clear set of topic and issue areas to address through education

The Partnership should develop clear direction and priorities for education and outreach organizations and agencies if the Partnership seeks their involvement in the work of cleaning up Puget Sound.

Within the survey, many traditional subjects (i.e. conservation, habitat restoration and wildlife) are covered by existing operations. However, some subjects (land acquisition, green trades and environmental justice) are not covered by many organizations and agencies. For example, if the Partnership decided to pursue projects related to environmental justice, there may be a need to support this work by encouraging existing groups to take on the subject or work with others to form partnerships to address this hypothetical priority.

It will be necessary, depending on the priority messages developed by the Partnership, to support new initiatives with existing organizations or agencies (or encourage the formation of new partnerships or organizations) if the subject of the campaign is not the current focus of groups.

It appears that many groups are focused on very traditional areas of interest for environmentally – related education and outreach efforts. Depending on the needs identified for cleaning up Puget Sound and priorities of the Partnership, it may be important to encourage the support of programs representing subjects that are underrepresented.

Recommendation #2: Provide support for more effective evaluation and assessment

There are disconnects between what are hopes and what are realities in evaluating and assessing the effectiveness of programs. Over 90% of groups want citizens to change their personal practices at home and work and 47% of groups actually measure the impact of their programs on actions taken by program participants. This is a positive indicator but we do not know the extent or level of assessment. However, just over 80% of groups want their program participants to have an increased knowledge of conservation issues facing Puget Sound but only 31% actually measure it. In comparing Survey Questions #11 and #12, there is an interesting dichotomy between what is hoped vs. what is actually measured. By a large margin (68%), most organizations and agencies measure satisfaction with their programs but generally do not measure the outcomes or changes they hope to see as a result of their programs.

Reviewing Survey Questions #12 and #13 illuminates a great need in the field of environmental education and outreach for rigorous, longitudinal evaluation demonstrating program impacts on human behavior. While customer satisfaction is important to program funding, improvement and sustainability, for the purposes of tracking impact on the health of Puget Sound, a new standard of

measurement and the resources to achieve this will be needed. Since respondents indicate that changes in behavior are what they are most interested in seeing, we can surmise that non-formal education and outreach program providers are ready to increase the rigor of their evaluation methods and fortunately, over half of the respondents are on their way.

What are roles for organizations and agencies for changing behaviors and how effective are they in doing that? How do organizations and agencies know they achieved their goals? How do we know the public has changed its behavior?

Resources should be allocated to assist education and outreach programs within organizations and agencies to focus their resources on specific measurable goals and then assess their effectiveness in reaching those goals. Support services, such as an on-call Program Assessment Team developed through the E3 Washington network, should be developed to guide, train and support non-profits and government agencies in this endeavor.

Are the most popular tools, techniques and methods (Special Events, Printed Materials and Public Events) chosen in the survey the most effective means of educating Puget Sound residents to think for themselves and take appropriate actions that will cleanup Puget Sound? How do we know this? What is the record?

These questions should be closely tied to evaluation and assessment too. As part of assisting organizations and agencies in improving the evaluation and assessment of their programs, techniques, tools and methods should also be reviewed to determine how well they work. The Program Assessment Team could report back to the education and outreach community on Best Practices and provide a valuable reference tool.

Most organizations and agencies in the survey (87%) use Community Events (Special or Annual Events) as an educational tool. With Community Events ranked this high, it would be valuable to encourage groups to evaluate their effectiveness given the resource (time, people and materials) intensive nature of this activity. An important comparison would be to see what financial and human resources are spent on Community Events in comparison to their effectiveness for changing behavior.

Recommendation #3: Link key areas of Topic/Issue focus and messages with Target Audiences

Matching messages to audiences is the most effective way to change behavior. Once the Partnership identifies its priorities for cleaning up Puget Sound, it will be important to develop key messages for target audiences and work with specific organizations and agencies to deliver those messages. To regularly target resources to *General Audiences* dilutes the message and wastes valuable resources. What actions do we want people to take, who should be the target audience and what are the best tools, techniques or methods to deliver the message are the key questions that need to be answered. Tailoring messages to specific target audiences will use resources more effectively and are more likely to result in the desired change.

Recommendation #4: Increase support for non-formal education

Much of the education and outreach work in the organizations and agencies that responded to this survey is done with small numbers of people – either volunteer-run or small full or part-time staffs. These findings underscore data gathered through regional and sector summits of the E3 Washington initiative. In order for education and outreach to play a greater role in public knowledge, valuing and actions, we will need to prioritize education in the policy and funding arenas and scale up the number of non-formal educators trained to provide quality education and outreach programs.

Recommendation #5: Increase Synergy across Professional Areas and Cultures

Some education and out reach organizations and agencies do not recognize or categorize themselves as part of a larger whole. In their eyes, the work they do is unique with no one filling the gap. There is a need to connect non-formal educators and organizations to a larger picture and help them identify the role they play in a Puget Sound-wide cleanup effort.

Some of the disconnection may rest in work cultures. There are differences between how government agencies and non-profit education and outreach providers operate, manage employees, develop policies and fund themselves. It is important for government agencies that provide financial support for community organizations through grants and contracts to understand the work culture of non-profits. Conversely, it will be important for non-profits to understand the rationale for government regulations and procedures.

Practical and exploratory forums geared to helping representatives of agencies, private businesses, tribal governments and non-profit organizations understand and better coordinate their fundamental operating differences, missions and needs will facilitate greater understanding and relationship building in order to accomplish common goals. Differences between work cultures must be bridged in order to accomplish the clean-up of Puget Sound.

If implemented, these recommendations will strengthen the education and outreach sector and assist these programs to become a strong partner in supporting the cleanup of Puget Sound.

Appendix

Puget Sound Partnership and E3 Washington Education and Outreach Survey Survey Plan and Timeline

Purpose

To determine the fiscal stability and needs, effectiveness and impact of non-formal educational organizations and programs in increasing the public's awareness of the poor environmental health of Puget Sound and moving people to more deeply value and take actions on behalf of Puget Sound ecology, communities and economies.

Goals

- Develop a project marketing strategy for reaching and inventorying the maximum number of providers in the region and beyond. (Ecology Grant)
- Sample non-formal environmental and sustainability education community around Puget Sound utilizing purposive sample technique
- Census non-formal environmental/conservation/sustainability education providers in 7 E3 Washington regions comprised of 12 counties surrounding Puget Sound to determine current status of their budgets, program offerings, numbers (including ages and audiences) served, their effectiveness and impact
- Analyze and map trends and patterns among these groups including access to programs by various economic, regional and cultural groups
- Determine future needs for these providers at both their existing level of activity and the desired scaled-up activity in order to achieve environmental literacy in the Puget Sound region
- Recommend action steps to increase the capacity, impact and evaluation of these organization's programs on public knowledge, attitudes and actions about and on behalf of a healthy and sustainable Puget Sound (socially, environmentally and economically)

Target Audience – Census

- Non-profit organizations with a mission to improve the Puget Sound environment and with education and outreach as a central activity or program in the organization strategic plan and budget– directors AND program managers
- Community-based organizations whose central mission is addressed through education and outreach programs that do and/or have the potential to improve the Puget Sound environment (not official non-profits) – directors AND program managers
- Government agencies (local, regional, state and federal) who provide non-formal education programs for youth, adults and families

Target Audiences – Results

- Puget Sound Partnership leaders (including staff, Council and ECO-Net members)
- E3 Washington regional and state-level leaders
- Education for Sustainability and Environment (ESE) community (non-schools)
- Federal, state, county and local elected officials and agency directors
- Business leaders
- Media members

Process

- Purposive sample with rigorous outreach and follow-up to ensure high return rate– on-line survey tool (i.e. Survey Monkey)
- Census - survey function via E3 Washington EE Resource Center website OR link through site to on-line survey tool (i.e. Survey Monkey) depending on functionality and ease of use

General Issues

- How should the purposive sample instrument and technique be designed to ensure an accurate picture for use by E3 Washington and the Puget Sound Partnership for use in developing both the E3 Comprehensive plan and the Puget Sound Action Agenda education and outreach recommendations?
- How should the E3 EERC be utilized in order to be the entry site and tool for a full scale inventory and census (broadest audience) and then report the results? What are criteria to decide?
- GIS mapping + reporting results – do we utilize PSP contractors or contract with an outside firm for developing? What about utilizing Google Maps?
- What incentives, methods and census design will help ensure a high survey response rate?

Survey Population

- What criteria and method do we use to identify all possible EE & ESE providers to survey?
- How do we overlap the announcement and purpose of the survey with marketing and populating the EERC?

Survey Design and Dissemination

- What is the best/preferred method to survey people/organizations?
 - A. Utilize the E3 network in the 12 counties and ECO-Net Steering committee to complete a listing for the Purposive Survey (based on the formula developed for this first step)
 - B. Develop and send a letter (electronically and hard copy) from Governor Gregoire, Bill Ruckelshaus and Billy Frank Jr. (E3 co-chairs and Partnership leads) requesting participation of providers in survey.
 - C. Enlist the outreach mechanisms of the Steering committee members to market the EERC and survey.
 - D. Generate a listing of all provider organizations utilizing the combined lists from the Puget Sound Partnership and the EEAW database.
 - E. Send survey directly to contacts that are currently registered on the E3 Washington on-line database (EERC).
 - F. Send a link to a separate survey location if using an outside survey host
- Keep survey length to 15 questions maximum and 20 minutes maximum to fill out.
- How do we best address the hesitation some might have regarding the disclosure of financial, evaluation and other information that is internal in nature?
 - Letter from E3 co-chairs
 - Follow-up message/outreach utilizing E3 electronic newsletter and Puget Sound partnership newsletter tools to remind and inspire participation (we will need to coordinate this follow-up so as not to confuse....)

- Incentives for survey completion (e.g. free registration to EEAW conference for first five respondents? a Partnership baseball cap for every respondent? Other ideas?)

Timeline

May – June 2008 Purposive Sample Development

- Develop strategy for purposive sample with professional support; reviewed by Advisory Group (follows)
- Administer sample to randomly selected respondents
- Analyze results and write up report based on initial results

July 2008

- Submit report to agency officials with notation of census results to follow

August – September 2008

- Revise questions used in purposive sample (above) based on results
- Review by E3 Regional Leadership Network and other interested parties in design and distribution of survey
- Refine survey tool on EERC (or on-line service) and test tool
- Identify marketing partners and recruit
- Begin campaign to populate EERC site and gain maximum number of survey respondents
- Open up survey for responses
- Send email messages to existing EERC participants
- Analyze results using GIS and report writing
- Release draft for review
- Release final report

October 2008

- Incorporate results into Puget Sound Action Agenda and final E3 Washington comprehensive plan for environmental and sustainability education

November 2008

- Hold session about results at EEAW conference and other venues as appropriate